T											Da	ta Com	ponen	t Ranki	ng Val	ue			Overall	Ranking	1	
CASGEM Groundwater Basin Prioritization Results Sorted by Basin Number											s		Gre	oundwa	dwater Relian						1	
											Wells	e d	م						Overall	0		
										Gro	<u>></u> *	Lea			*	e,		_ ا	Basin	Overall Basin	Impact Comments	Other Information Comments
						Basin A	Area		tion	tion	Supply * ***	d Ac	*	, de	dan	ianc	v	l idi	Ranking	Duianitus		
Basin count	Basin Numb	Basin Name	Sub-Basin Name	Hydrologic Region	DWR Region			2010 Population	pulation	opulation	ublic 9	rotal we	V Use	rcent	otal S	v Reli tal	Impacts	her	Score ***			
					Office	Acres 5			P		<u> </u>		_			GW Tota	_	i o				
2	1-19 1-20			North Coast North Coast	NCRO NCRO	4,969 2,242	7.8 3.5			5	5 3. 0 2.		_		l 1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low Very Low		
3	1-20			North Coast	NCRO	24,085	37.6					75 2		_		0	1	0	0.0	Very Low	The terrace deposits between Ten Mile River and Laguna Point and	
								,												,	Alder Creek and Point Arena are susceptible to seawater intrusion.	
4	1 27	COTTONEVA CREEK VALLEY		North Coast	NCRO	763	1.2	1	0	0	0 1	.5 0	0	C	,	0	0	0	0.0	Van Lau	(B-118).	
5	1-37 1-38			North Coast North Coast	NCRO	2,152	3.4				0 2.				1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low Very Low		
6	1-39			North Coast	NCRO	1,381	2.2		1	0	0 3		. 1	1	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
7 8	1-40 1-41			North Coast North Coast	NCRO NCRO	1,491 812	2.3 1.3		1 1	0	0 3	3 0 .5 2				0	0	0	0.0	Very Low Very Low		
9	1-41			North Coast	NCRO	1,150	1.8		3 1	0	0 1					0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
10	1-43			North Coast	NCRO	1,642	2.6		0	0	0 2.)	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
11	1-44			North Coast	NCRO NCRO	1,376 1,685	2.2		0 1	0	0 (5 1	5 0				0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
12 13	1-45 1-46			North Coast North Coast	NCRO	770	1.2		1	0	0 1					0	0	0	0.0	Very Low Very Low		
14	1-49	ANNAPOLIS OHLSON RANCH		North Coast	NCRO	8,646	13.5			0	0 2.		. 1	2		0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
15	1 50	FM HIGHLANDS KNIGHTS VALLEY		North Coast	NCRO	4,086	6.4	102	2 1	0	0 2.	25 4	. 2	4	1	0	0	0	0.0	Vondlass		
16	1-50			North Coast North Coast	NCRO	8,237	12.9			0	1 3.				•	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low Very Low		
17	1-52			North Coast	NCRO	37,508	58.6			1	3 3.		_		2	2	0	1	15.8	Medium		2010 Ukiah Valley Water Supply Assessment expresses concerns
																						regarding SWRCB assertion that all or most of the "groundwater" in the basin is, for legal purposes, underflow from the Russian River
																						and associated tributarieswhich support endangered fishery.
18		SANEL VALLEY		North Coast	NCRO	5,568	8.7				4		_		3	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
19 20	1-54.0	1 ALEXANDER VALLEY 2 ALEXANDER VALLEY	ALEXANDER AREA CLOVERDALE AREA	North Coast North Coast	NCRO NCRO	24,464 6,525	38.2 10.2		2 2	0 4	4 3. 5 3.				1	0	0 1	0	0.0	Very Low Very Low	Elevated Boron detected in 3 of 3 wells (B-118). Site in Southern	
20	1 54.0	Z / LEW WOLK WILLE	CEOVERD/ILE /IRE/	North Coust	Neno	0,323	10.2	0,237	_		3 3.	, ,				Ü	•		0.0	Very 2000	Cloverdale is on the EPA's Superfund Priority List (MGM Brakes) VOCs detected in pw (FPA 1983).	
21		1 SANTA ROSA VALLEY	SANTA ROSA PLAIN	North Coast	NCRO	80,059	125.1	250,375	3	2	5 3.		2	2	2	2	0	0	18.8	Medium	VOCS DETECTED IT EW TEPA 170.31.	
22		2 SANTA ROSA VALLEY	HEALDSBURG AREA	North Coast	NCRO	15,400	24.1		2	0	5 3.					0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
23 24	1-55.0	3 SANTA ROSA VALLEY McDOWELL VALLEY	RINCON VALLEY	North Coast North Coast	NCRO NCRO	5,549 1,486	8.7 2.3		4 1	3	5 3. 0 3.		2			0	0	0	0.0	Very Low Very Low		
25	1-57			North Coast	NCRO	2,676	4.2	719	1	0	5	3 0			5	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
26	1-59	WILSON GROVE FORMATION HIGHLANDS		North Coast	NCRO	86,400	135.0	37,799	2	0	4 3.	75 2	. 0	C)	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
27	1-60	LOWER RUSSIAN RIVER VALLEY		North Coast	NCRO	6,640	10.4	3,754	2	2	5	3	2	1	1	0	1	0	0.0	Very Low	Brackish water found in wells near the Russian River from the river mouth to below Duncan Mills (5 to 6 miles). During a period of extremely low	
																					streamflow, saline water might extend 10 miles upstream from river	
																					mouth to Monte Rio.(B-118).	
28	1-61	FORT ROSS TERRACE DEPOSITS		North Coast	NCRO	8,483	13.3	1,075	1	2	4 3	3 0	1	4	1	0	1	0	0.0	Very Low	Seawater intrusion is not a common problem but it has occurred in	
																					localized areas near Point Arena and Iverson Point (DWR 1982). The	
																					Terrace deposits between Alder Creek and Point Arena are	
																					susceptible to seawater intrusion (DWR 1982, & B-118).	
29	2-1	PETALUMA VALLEY		San Francisco	NCRO	46,043	71.9	49,915	2	3	3 3.	75 3	1	2	2	1.5	2	0	18.3	Medium	Widespread and serious nitrate contamination affecting shallow	
				Bay																	wells in the upland area NW of Petaluma. Generally poor quality gw	
																					south of Petaluma. Potential for seawater intrusion in tidal reaches Increasing MTBE contamination.(B-118 unpublished data).	
30	2-10	LIVERMORE VALLEY		San Francisco Bay	NCRO	69,531	108.6	196,658	3	3	3 3.	75 2	1	2	2	1.5	1	0	17.3	Medium	Some areas have boron concentrations exceeding 2 mg/L (B-118 & Sorenson et. al. 1985).	
31	2-11	SUNOL VALLEY		San Francisco	NCRO	16,623	26.0	808	3 1	0	0 2.	25 1	. 1	3	3	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	30. Ch3011 Ct. di. 1303).	
32	2-19	KENWOOD VALLEY		Bay San Francisco	NCRO	5,135	8.0	6,057	2	1	5 3.	75 3	1	1	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
33	2-2.0	1 NAPA-SONOMA VALLEY	NAPA VALLEY	Bay San Francisco	NCRO	45,895	71.7	91.234	3	1	5 3.	75 4	3	3	3	3	1	0	20.8	Medium	Two isolated areas in the Sonoma Valley indicate substantial	
]		The state of the s		Bay		.5,055	, 1.,	31,23		-	J.	"				-	1				declines in gw elevations and RWQCB report that 43 underground	
																		1			fuel tank leaks have occurred in the basin (unpublished B-118 data)	
1																		1			(Ludhorff & Scalmanini Consulting Engineers, 1999).	
34	2-2.0	NAPA-SONOMA VALLEY	SONOMA VALLEY	San Francisco	NCRO	44,626	69.7	31,275	2	1	3 3.	75 4	1	2	2	1.5	1	0	16.3	Medium	Brackish water occurs in deposits near San Pablo Bay and along the	
1				Bay														1			tidal portions of Sonoma creek. RWQCB reports 43 underground	
1																		1			fuel tank leaks have occurred in the basin (unpublished B-118 data) (Ludhorff & Scalmanini,	
																		1	1		1999)	
35	2-2.0	NAPA-SONOMA VALLEY	NAPA-SONOMA	San Francisco	NCRO	40,455	63.2	58,367	2	0	2	3 2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low		
36	2-22	HALF MOON BAY TERRACE	LOWLANDS	Bay San Francisco	NCRO	9,189	14.4	19,825	3	3	5 3.	75 3	1	3	3	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	<u> </u>	
				Bay			•													,		

Г												Data C	Compo	nent R	Ranking	Value			Ove	rall Ran	nking		
CASGEM Groundwater Basin Prioritization Results											Wells			Grou	ndwate	e					Impact Comments	Other Information Comments	
	Sorted by Basin Number												eage		*				Overa Basi	10			Overall
					DWR	Basin Area			ion	ion G	Supply	Wells *	d Acre	*	of ipply	ance			Fanki	ng l	Basin Priority	impact comments	other information comments
Basin count	Basin Number	Basin Name	Sub-Basin Name	Hydrologic Region	Region	Acres Sq.		2010 Population	pulati	pulatio	blics	otal We	rrigated	/ Use	rcent tal Su	ent al Su		her	Score '	***			
37	2-24	SAN GREGORIO VALLEY		San Francisco	Office NCRO	1,074	1.7	. 66	Pc	0	0	2.25	۵ Irr	O	0 Pe	O GW	o Impacts	 5	0.0	Ve	ery Low		
38	2-26	PESCADERO VALLEY		Bay San Francisco	NCRO	2,904	4.5	571	1	0	4	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0.0		ery Low		
	2-27	SAND POINT AREA		Bay		1,405	2.2	43							4			0					
39				San Francisco Bay	NCRO					0		0.75	0	1		0	0	ļ.	0.0		ery Low		
40	2-28	ROSS VALLEY		San Francisco Bay	NCRO	1,763	2.8	7,194		2	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.0		ery Low		
41	2-29	SAN RAFAEL VALLEY		San Francisco Bay	NCRO	874	1.4	10,153	5	1	0	3.75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Ve	ery Low		
42	2-3	SUISUN-FAIRFIELD VALLEY		San Francisco Bay	NCRO	133,505	208.6	136,754	2	5	1	2.25	2	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Ve	ery Low		
43	2-30	NOVATO VALLEY		San Francisco Bay	NCRO	20,519	32.1	42,516	3	2	0	3.75	3	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Ve	ery Low		
44	2-31	ARROYO DEL HAMBRE VALLEY		San Francisco	NCRO	786	1.2	3,230	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Ve	ery Low		
45	2-32	VISITACION VALLEY		Bay San Francisco	NCRO	5,827	9.1	31,853	4	4	0	3.75	0	0	1	0	0	0	0.0	Ve	ery Low		
46	2-33	ISLAIS VALLEY		Bay San Francisco	NCRO	5,937	9.3	131,576	5	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Ve	ery Low		
47	2-35	WESTSIDE		Bay San Francisco	NCRO	25,386	39.7	351,235	5	2	4	3.75	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Ve	ery Low		
48	2-36	SAN PEDRO VALLEY		Bay San Francisco	NCRO	702	1.1	5,956	5	0	0	3.75	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Ve	ery Low		
49	2-37	SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO		Bay San Francisco	NCRO	2,175	3.4	38,861	5	1		3.75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0		ery Low		
50		LOBOS		Bay San Francisco	NCRO	2,359	3.7	59,119		0		2.25		0	0	0	1	0			· ·	Limited water quality data but basins beneath the entire San Francisco	
30	2-30	LOBOS		Bay	NCKO	2,339	3.7	39,119	3	U	U	2.25	U	U			1		0.0	Ve	,	peninsula are similar (Phillips et.al. 1993). May contain high concentrations of nitrates, chloride, boron and TDS.(8-118)	
51	2-39	MARINA		San Francisco	NCRO	2,186	3.4	45,294	5	0	0	2.25	0	0	0	0	1	0	0.0	Ve	ery Low	Limited water quality data but basins beneath the entire San Francisco	
				Bay				ŕ													,	peninsula are similar (Phillips et.al. 1993). May contain high concentrations of nitrates, chloride, boron and TDS.(B-118)	
52	2-4	PITTSBURG PLAIN		San Francisco Bav	NCRO	11,607	18.1	68,898	4	3	4	3.75	0	2	1	0	0	0	0.0	Ve	ery Low		
53	2-40	DOWNTOWN		San Francisco	NCRO	7,635	11.9	323,721	5	1	0	3.75	0	0	0	0	1	0	0.0	Ve	ery Low	Groundwater is subject to high concentrations of nitrates, chloride,	
54	2-5	CLAYTON VALLEY		Bay San Francisco	NCRO	17,836	27.9	73,287	4	1	2	3.75	1	1	1	0	0	0	0.0	Ve	ery Low	boron and TDS (B-118) & (Phillips et.al. 1993).	
55	2-6	YGNACIO VALLEY		Bay San Francisco	NCRO	15,459	24.2	107,878	5	1	2	3.75	1	1	1	0	1	0	0.0	Ve	- /	Hydrographs created from DWR well data indicate groundwater levels	
				Bay																		have declined gradually over the period of record.(B-118)	
56		SAN RAMON VALLEY		San Francisco Bay	NCRO	7,053	11.0	30,112	4	2		3.75	1	1	1	0	0	0	0.0	Ve	ery Low		
57	2-8	CASTRO VALLEY		San Francisco Bay	NCRO	1,821	2.8	24,486	5	0	0	3.75	0	2	1	0	0	0	0.0	Ve	ery Low		
58	2-9.01	SANTA CLARA VALLEY	NILES CONE	San Francisco Bay	NCRO	57,906	90.5	321,494	4	1	3	3.75	1	4	4	4	3	0	19.8	N	Medium	Saline water intrusion has increased landward and into deeper aguifers since first documented in the 1920's.(B-118)	
59	2-9.02	SANTA CLARA VALLEY	SANTA CLARA	San Francisco	NCRO	190,235	297.2	1,633,190	5	2	4	3.75	0	5	4	4.5	1	0	20.3	N	Medium	Areas with elevated mineral levels have been observed in the	
	2.0.00	CANTA CIADA VIVITI	CANALATEC STATE	Bay	Ness	27 -22	50.0	201.05				2					1.				, ,	northern basin (SCVWD 2001). Elevated nitrate in some wells in the southern portion of the Basin (SCVWD).	
60		SANTA CLARA VALLEY	SAN MATEO PLAIN	San Francisco Bay	NCRO	37,708	58.9	291,899		3	2			0	0	1.0	1				•	2003 Water Board Study of South Bay groundwater basins	
61	2-9.04	SANTA CLARA VALLEY	EAST BAY PLAIN	San Francisco Bay	NCRO	77,292	120.8	881,718	5	1	1	3.75	1	0	0	1	2	0	14.8	N		SFRWQCB (1999) identified 13 locations as areas of major groundwater pollution. Most contamination appears to be	
																						restricted to the upper 50 feet of the subsurface. (B-118) & (RWOCB 1999)	
62	5-20	BERRYESSA VALLEY		Sacramento River	NCRO	1,375	2.1	0	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Ve	ery Low		
63	5-21.60	SACRAMENTO VALLEY	NORTH YUBA	Sacramento River	NCRO	103,152	161.2	14,667	1	1	2	2.25	4	4	2	3	0	1	14.3	N	Medium		Strong SW-GW interaction with Feather and Yuba River
64	5-21.61	SACRAMENTO VALLEY	SOUTH YUBA	Sacramento	NCRO	104,486	163.3	45,014	2	1	3	3	4	2	1	1.5	0	0	14.5	N	Medium		
65	5-21.62	SACRAMENTO VALLEY	SUTTER	River Sacramento	NCRO	234,264	366.0	82,125	1	4	2	3	5	4	1	2.5	0	0	17.5	N	Medium		
<u> </u>				River																			

														nent R	lanking \	/alue			Overa	all Ranking			
		CASGEM G		rowth	y Wells		Acreage	Grou	* *	Reliance			Overall Basin	Overall	Impact Comments O	Other Information Comments							
Basin Basi count Numi		Basin Name	Sub-Basin Name	Hydrologic Region	DWR Region Office	Basin		2010 Population	Population	Population G	Public Supply	Total Wells *	Irrigated Acr	GW Use **	Percent of Total Supply	GW Reliance Total	Impacts	Other	Ranking Score **			other miorination comments	
66 5-21.	1.64 S	ACRAMENTO VALLEY	NORTH AMERICAN	Sacramento River	NCRO	340,170	531.5	832,746	3	3	4	3	4	5	2	3.5	1	1	22.5	High	boron, fluoride, nitrate, iron manganese, and arsenic may be of concern in some locations (DWR 1997). There are 3 sites with wells	dwater levels in southwestern Placer County and ento County have generally declined with many of about one and one-half feet per year for the ore (PCWA	
		ACRAMENTO VALLEY	SOUTH AMERICAN	Sacramento River	NCRO	247,745	387.1	718,113	3	3	4	3.75	3	3	2	2.5	3	0	22.3	High	From B118: Montgomery Watson (1997) listed seven sites within the subbasin with significant groundwater contamination. From Sac County GWMP: Overall decreasing groundwater level trend over past 50 years (~30ft)		
68 5-21	L.66 S	ACRAMENTO VALLEY	SOLANO	Sacramento River	NCRO	424,832	663.8	119,263	1	3	2	3	5	2	1	1.5	0	0	15.5	Medium			
		ACRAMENTO VALLEY	YOLO	Sacramento River	NCRO	225,718	352.7	194,158	2	3	3	3.75	5	5	2	3.5	2	0	22.3	High	Localized TDS problems preclude using gw for some M&I uses without treatment. Some subsidence in northeast of Davis and in northern Yolo.		
70 5-21	L.68 S	ACRAMENTO VALLEY	CAPAY VALLEY	Sacramento River	NCRO	24,970	39.0	550	1	0	1	3	3	2	3	2.5	1	0	11.5	Low	moderate to high levels of boron.		
71 5-22.	2.01 S	AN JOAQUIN VALLEY	EASTERN SAN JOAQUIN	San Joaquin River	NCRO	707,073	1,104.8	582,662	2	4	3	3	5	4	3	3.5	3	2	25.5	High	San Joaquin County and about 35,000 af/year of overdraft occurs in the Stockton East Water District (B-118) & (USBR 1996). Basin Delta and has con	esult of overdraft poor quality groundwater has along a 16- mile front on the east side of the tinued to migrate eastward (USACE 2001). Large ontamination are located in the subbasin.	
72 5-22	2.15 S	AN JOAQUIN VALLEY	TRACY	San Joaquin	NCRO	344,884	538.9	268,175	2	4	3	3	5	1	1	1	1	0	19.0	Medium	Poor water quality throughout the subbasin.(B-118)		
73 5-22	2.16 S	AN JOAQUIN VALLEY	COSUMNES	River San Joaquin	NCRO	280,490	438.3	59,163	1	2	2	3	3	4	4	4	0	0	15.0	Medium			
74 5-6	68 P	OPE VALLEY		River Sacramento	NCRO	7,177	11.2	110	1	0	0	1.5	4	2	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low			
75 6-10	.05 S	LINKARD VALLEY		River North Lahontan	NCRO	4,517	7.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low			
76 6-10	.06 L	ITTLE ANTELOPE VALLEY		North Lahontan	NCRO	2,491	3.9	0	0	0	0	0.75	3	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low			
77 6-10	.07 S	WEETWATER FLAT		North Lahontan	NCRO	4,747	7.4	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low			
78 6-10	.08 C	DLYMPIC VALLEY		North Lahontan	NCRO	702	1.1	471	2	0	5	2.25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low			
79 6-5.0	.01 T	AHOE VALLEY	TAHOE SOUTH	North Lahontan	NCRO	14,814	23.1	25,967	3	0	5	3.75	0	4	5	4.5	2	0	18.3	Medium	STPUD reports that MTBE has had a major impact on the groundwater supply within its service area, resulting in 12 of 34 production wells unusable and the destruction of 2 wells. (B-118) & (Berghson 2000)		
80 6-5.0	.02 T	AHOE VALLEY	TAHOE WEST	North Lahontan	NCRO	6,173	9.6	3,110	2	0	5	3.75	0	1	4	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low	MELENNI ANNI		
81 6-5.0	.03 T	AHOE VALLEY	TAHOE NORTH	North Lahontan	NCRO	1,931	3.0	3,410	3	0	5	3	0	3	4	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low			
82 6-6	-6 C	ARSON VALLEY		North Lahontan	NCRO	10,716	16.7	328	1	0	3	2.25	3	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low			
83 6-6	67 N	MARTIS VALLEY		North Lahontan	NCRO	36,381	56.8	14,743	2	4	3	3	0	3	5	4	0	1	17.0	Medium	Strong SW-GW int	teraction with Martis Creek, as per 2013 GWMP	
84 6-7	-7 A	NTELOPE VALLEY		North Lahontan	NCRO	20,125	31.4	876	1	0	3	2.25	5	0	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low			
85 6-8	-8 B	RIDGEPORT VALLEY		North Lahontan	NCRO	32,545	50.9	586	1	0	2	0.75	4	0	1	0	0	0	0.0	Very Low			

NOTE: * Data component values were reduced by 25% due to data confidence, prior to calculating total GW basin ranking value

** Sub-fields that are used to determine the overal GW Reliance Total ((GW Use + GW %)/2)

*** Overall Basin Ranking Score = Population + Population Growth + PSW + (Total Wells x .75) + Irr Acreage + (GW Use + GW %)/2 + Impacts + Other